REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are canceled. New claims 13-22 are in this application.

New claims 13-22 are believed to be distinguishable over the references as applied by the Examiner in the Office Action. That is, neither U.S. Patent No. 6,487,253 to Jones IV, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,314 to Cimini, nor U.S. Patent No. 6,463,105 to Ramesh as applied by the Examiner appears to disclose a "...filter being selected from a set of filters on the basis of an estimated carrier to interference ratio," as in claims 13 and 18.

Jones IV appears to disclose systems and methods for estimating a channel response in the presence of interference and/or noise. Based on the measured noise and/or interference, a channel response estimate is determined. However, Jones IV does not suggest to select a filter for the channel estimation on the basis of an estimated carrier to interference ratio.

Cimini appears to disclose a method and an apparatus providing a channel estimation for multicarrier systems. In Cimini, a minimum mean-square-error channel estimator is suggested, which makes full use of time-and-frequency-domain correlation of the frequency response of time-varying dispersive failing channels (see abstract and column 4, lines 60 to 61). A correlation function of the channel frequency response over all the channels is separated into the multiplication of a time-domain correlation and a frequency-domain correlation (see column 4, lines 50 to 54). The coefficients for the estimator calculations, e.g. the time-related filters, are set taking into account the maximum delay spread and are chosen to match a rectangular spectrum rather then attempting to match the doppler spectrum (see column 5, lines 20 to 25).

Cimini therefore appears to specifically disclose how the time correlated filters should be set and does not suggest selecting a filter based on the estimated carrier to interference ratio.

Ramesh appears to disclose methods and systems for calculating a carrier to interference ratio of a channel. Ramesh does not appear to disclose using the carrier to interference ratio for the selection of a channel estimation filter from a set of filters. Ramesh only discloses to use the carrier to interference ratio to select a channel for use by a mobile terminal which may provide acceptable performance at the lowest transmission power level.

Accordingly, independent claims 13-18, as well as dependent claims 14-17 and 19-22, which depend therefrom, are believed to be distinguishable over the references as applied by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited references, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: _____

Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800

00221974